

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

DANTE H. PATTISON,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRIAN SANDOVAL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00287-MMD-WGC

ORDER

*Pro se* Plaintiff Dante Pattison filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 7.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 47), recommending that Pattison’s motion (ECF No. 45 (“Motion”)) seeking to consolidate this action with *Caballero v. Aranas* (Case No. 3:19-cv-00079-MMD-WGC) be denied. Pattison had until September 9, 2021, to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts Judge Cobb’s R&R and will deny Pattison’s Motion.


The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

1 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is  
2 satisfied Judge Cobb did not clearly err. Here, Judge Cobb recommends Pattison's  
3 Motion be denied because Pattison and Caballero—the inmate plaintiff in the requested  
4 consolidated action—have different allegations regarding the dental care they received  
5 and what care they believed was deficient. (ECF No. 47 at 6.) Additionally, both Pattison  
6 and Caballero suffered different dental injuries. (*Id.*) The Court agrees with Judge Cobb.  
7 Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

8 It is therefore ordered that Judge Cobb's Report and Recommendation (ECF No.  
9 47) is accepted and adopted in full.

10 If is further ordered that Plaintiff Dante Pattison's motion (ECF No. 45) seeking to  
11 consolidate this action is denied.

12 DATED THIS 14<sup>th</sup> Day of September 2021.

13  
14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 MIRANDA M. DU  
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28